

Unifed States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
10/038,409		01/03/2002	Michael Allen Yudkowsky	42390p13063	7057		
8791	7590	05/19/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
		LOFF TAYLOR &	ARMSTRONG, ANGELA A				
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVEN LOS ANGELES, CA 90025			NIH FLOOR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
200	,			2654	5		
•				DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004	4		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicat	tion No.	cant(s)	cant(s)				
		10/038,4	409	YUDKOWSKY, MICHAEL ALLEN	LEN				
	Office Action Summary	Examine	ər	Art Unit					
			A. Armstrong	2654					
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this commu r Reply	nication appears on th	ne cover sheet with	the correspondence address					
THE N - Exten after: - If the - If NO - Failur Any n	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD IN MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN sions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comperiod for reply specified above is less than thirty (period for reply is specified above, the maximum is to reply within the set or extended period for reply preceived by the Office later than three months dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NICATION. as of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e imunication. (30) days, a reply within the sta statutory period will apply and by will, by statute, cause the ap	event, however, may a rep atutory minimum of thirty (will expire SIX (6) MONTH oplication to become ABA	ly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on <i>01 March 200</i> 4	4.						
•		2b) This action is							
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restri	are withdrawn from co							
Application	on Papers								
	The specification is objected to by the								
-	Γhe drawing(s) filed on is/are								
	Applicant may not request that any obje								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) includin The oath or declaration is objected t								
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) <u></u> / a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority	y documents have be y documents have be s of the priority docum onal Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Appents have been re ule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage					
Attachment	(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			mmary (PTO-413)					
3) Inform Paper	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o No(s)/Mail Date			Mail Date promal Patent Application (PTO-152) .					

Application/Control Number: 10/038,409

Art Unit: 2654

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 1. Claims 1-12 and 14-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goronzy et al (EP 1022725 A1).

Goronzy discloses a system for the selection of acoustic models using speaker verification.

2. Regarding claim 1, Goronzy discloses determining an identity of a speaker through a network over which output data, including identification information, is provided to one or more speech-recognition systems, at col. 3, lines 1-9 and 35-46, since the networked system (col. 3, lines 2-3) checks the identity of the speaker every time the speaker changes, which requires use of some form of identification information to output to the verification module (4). Additionally, Goronzy discloses attempting to locate, based on the identity of the speaker, a voice model for speaker, at col. 3, lines 53-58; and retrieving from a storage area the voice model for the speaker if the voice model for the speaker is located, at col. 3, line 53 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 2, Goronzy discloses the voice model comprises a speaker dependent voice model at col. 3, line 53 continuing to col. 4, line 2.



Application/Control Number: 10/038,409

Art Unit: 2654

Regarding claim 3, Goronzy discloses wherein determining the identity of the speaker over the network comprises using identification information received from the speaker over the network to determine the identity of the speaker, at col. 3, line 1 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 4, Goronzy discloses receiving from a device in the network identifying data regarding the speaker, at col. 3, line 39 continuing to col. 4, line 2; determining the identity of the speaker based on the identifying data regarding the speaker, at col. 3, line 39 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 5, Goronzy discloses wherein the storage area comprises an internal storage area containing speaker-dependent voice models for multiple persons, at col. 3, line 58 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 6, Goronzy discloses wherein the storage area comprises an external storage area accessible over the network, at col. 3, line 58 continuing to col. 4, line 2.

Regarding claim 7, Goronzy discloses wherein the output data comprise phonemes, at col. 3, line 39.

Regarding claim 8, Goronzy discloses receiving an utterance from the speaker at col. 3, lines 39-43; using the voice model to extract phonemes from the utterance at col. 3, lines 39-52; and transmitting the phonemes over the network to the speech-recognition system, at col. 3, lines 39-43.

Regarding claim 9, Goronzy discloses wherein the utterance comprises one or both of the vocalized words and vocalized sounds, at col. 3, lines 39-43.

Regarding claim 10, Goronzy discloses receiving from the speech recognition system contents of a recognized utterance of the speaker, at col. 3, lines 43-58; revising the voice model



Art Unit: 2654

for the speaker based on the contents of the recognized utterance, at col. 3, lines 53-58; col. 4, lines 30-40.

Regarding claim 11, Goronzy discloses wherein the output data comprise a voice model for the speaker, at col. 3, lines 53-58; col. 4, lines 30-40.

Regarding claim 12, Goronzy discloses further comprising transmitting the voice model over the network to the speech-recognition system, at col. 3, lines 53-58.

Regarding claim 14, Goronzy discloses retrieving a speaker-independent voice model if failing to locate the voice model for the speaker, at col. 4, lines 30-40; receiving an utterance from the speaker, at col. 4, lines 19-21; using the speaker-independent voice model to extract phonemes from the utterance, at col. 3, lines 53-58; transmitting the phonemes over the network to a speech-recognition system, at col. 3, lines 43-52; receiving from the speech-recognition system contents of a recognized utterance of the speaker, at col. 3, lines 46-58 and col. 4, lines 17-40; and generating a voice model for the speaker based on the contents of the recognized utterance, at col. 4, lines 17-40.

Regarding claims 15-30 claims 15-30 are similar in scope and content to claims 1-12 and 14 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person



Art Unit: 2654

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goronzy in view of
 Ellis et al, "Tandem Acoustic Modeling in Large Vocabulary Recognition", (ICASSP '01).
 2001 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 2001
 Proceedings, vol. 1, pages 517-520.
- 4. Regarding claim 13, Goronzy does not specifically teach implementation of Aurora feature extraction. However, implementation of Aurora features was well known in the art.

In a similar field of endeavor, Ellis teaches a system of tandem acoustic modeling in a large vocabulary recognition system, and specifically describes the advantages of using Aurora data in a recognition system since the system involves recognizing data in a wide range of noisy backgrounds.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the system of Goronzy to implement Aurora feature processing, for the purpose of providing a recognition system that is able to recognize data in noisy backgrounds, as taught by Ellis.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/038,409

Art Unit: 2654

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2654

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela A. Armstrong whose telephone number is 703-308-6258.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (703) 305-9645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Angela A. Armstrong Examiner Art Unit 2654

AAA May 16, 2004

RICHEMOND DORVIL